

AUSTIN, TX 78701

UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO. FILING DATE		ILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/775,818		02/10/2004	Sean M. Kerwin	UTSB:679USC2 8168	
32425	7590	04/28/2005		EXAMINER	
FULBRIG 600 CONG		WORSKI L.L.P.		DAVIS, ZINNA	NORTHINGTON
SUITE 2400				ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER

1625 DATE MAILED: 04/28/2005

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

PTO-90C (Rev. 10/03)

M

		Application No.	Applicant(s)					
Office Action Summan		10/775,818	KERWIN ET AL.					
	Office Action Summary	Examiner	Art Unit					
		Zinna Northington Davis	1625					
Period fo	The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address Period for Reply							
A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 1 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION. - Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication. - If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely. - If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication. - Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). - Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b). Status								
1)[Responsive to communication(s) filed on	<u> </u>						
2a) <u></u> ☐	This action is FINAL . 2b)⊠ Thi	is action is non-final.	!					
3) Dispositi	3) Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under <i>Ex parte Quayle</i> , 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213. Disposition of Claims							
4)⊠ Claim(s) <u>1-36</u> is/are pending in the application.								
•	4a) Of the above claim(s) is/are withdrawn from consideration.							
	Claim(s) is/are allowed.							
	Claim(s) is/are rejected.							
	Claim(s) is/are objected to.							
·	Claim(s) <u>1-36</u> are subject to restriction and/or e	election requirement.						
Application Papers								
9)□ -	The specification is objected to by the Examiner	r.						
10) 🔲 🗆	10)☐ The drawing(s) filed on is/are: a)☐ accepted or b)☐ objected to by the Examiner.							
	Applicant may not request that any objection to the		, ,					
11) 🔲 7	The proposed drawing correction filed on	_ is: a) ☐ approved b) ☐ disappro	ved by the Examiner.					
_	If approved, corrected drawings are required in rep	•						
12)[7	The oath or declaration is objected to by the Exa	aminer.						
Priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 119 and 120								
13) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).								
a)[☐ All b)☐ Some * c)☐ None of:							
	1. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.							
	2. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No							
 3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)). * See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received. 								
	14)⊠ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(e) (to a provisional application).							
a) The translation of the foreign language provisional application has been received. 15) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 120 and/or 121.								
Attachment(s)								
2) Notice	ce of References Cited (PTO-892) ce of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) mation Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449) Paper No(s)	5) Notice of Informal P	r (PTO-413) Paper No(s) Patent Application (PTO-152)					

Application/Control Number: 10/775,818 Page 2

Art Unit: 1625

Election/Restrictions

1. Restriction to one of the following inventions is required under 35 U.S.C. 121:

- I. Claims 1-12, 29, 34, and 36, drawn to a method of reducing proliferative capacity of a cell comprising contacting said cell with a compound of formula (I).
- II. Claims 13, 33 and 35, drawn to a compound of formula (I).
- III. Claims 14-18, 30, and 32, drawn to a method of reducing proliferative capacity of a cell comprising contacting said cell with a compound of formula (II).
- IV. Claims 19-23, drawn to a method of reducing telomeric extension comprising administering a compound of formula (II).
- V. Claim 24, drawn to a method for identifying a candidate compound that inhibits telomerase activity.
- VI. Claim 25, drawn to a method for identifying a telomerase inhibitor.
- VII. Claim 26, drawn to another method for identifying a telomerase inhibitor.
- VIII. Claim 27, drawn to a method of identifying a telomerase inhibitor.
- IX. Claim 28 and 31, drawn to a compound of formula (II).
- 2. Inventions I- IX are related as product and process of use. The inventions can be shown to be distinct if either or both of the following can be shown: (1) the process for using the product as claimed can be practiced with another materially different product or (2) the product as claimed can be used in a materially different process of

using that product (MPEP § 806.05(h)). In the instant case, the product as claimed can be used in a materially different process of using that product. See claims 14-27.

- 3. This application contains claims directed to the following patentably distinct species of the claimed invention: R¹, R², R³, R⁴, R, C, and B.
- 4. The ring system and radicals within the definition of R¹, R², R³, R⁴, R, C, and B are diverse in scope. A prior art reference, which anticipates one member of C such as ethylene under 35 U.S.C. 102, would not render obvious another member such as phenylene under 35 U.S.C. 103. Accordingly, the ring systems and the radicals are independent and patentably distinct.
- 5. Applicant is required under 35 U.S.C. 121 to elect a single disclosed species for prosecution on the merits to which the claims shall be restricted if no generic claim is finally held to be allowable. Currently, claims 1-53 are generic.

Applicant is advised that a response to this requirement must include an identification of the species that is elected consonant with this requirement, and a listing of all claims readable thereon, including any claims subsequently added. An argument that a claim is allowable or that all claims are generic is considered nonresponsive unless accompanied by an election.

Upon the allowance of a generic claim, applicant will be entitled to consideration of claims to additional species which are written in dependent form or otherwise include all the limitations of an allowed generic claim as provided by 37 C.F.R. 1.141. If claims are added after the election, applicant must indicate which are readable upon the elected species. M.P.E.P. 809.02(a).

Application/Control Number: 10/775,818 Page 4

Art Unit: 1625

Should applicant traverse on the ground that the species are not patentably distinct, applicant should submit evidence or identify such evidence now of record showing the species to be obvious variants or clearly admit on the record that this is the case. In either instance, if the examiner finds one of the inventions unpatentable over the prior art, the evidence or admission may be used in a rejection under 35 U.S.C. 103 of the other invention.

- 5. Because these inventions are distinct for the reasons given above and have acquired a separate status in the art because of their recognized divergent subject matter, restriction for examination purposes as indicated is proper.
- 6. The examiner has required restriction between product and process claims. Where applicant elects claims directed to the product, and a product claim is subsequently found allowable, withdrawn process claims that depend from or otherwise include all the limitations of the allowable product claim will be rejoined in accordance with the provisions of MPEP § 821.04. Process claims that depend from or otherwise include all the limitations of the patentable product will be entered as a matter of right if the amendment is presented prior to final rejection or allowance, whichever is earlier. Amendments submitted after final rejection are governed by 37 CFR 1.116; amendments submitted after allowance are governed by 37 CFR 1.312.
- 7. In the event of rejoinder, the requirement for restriction between the product claims and the rejoined process claims will be withdrawn, and the rejoined process claims will be fully examined for patentability in accordance with 37 CFR 1.104. Thus, to be allowable, the rejoined claims must meet all criteria for patentability including the

Application/Control Number: 10/775,818

Art Unit: 1625

requirements of 35 U.S.C. 101, 102, 103, and 112. Until an elected product claim is found allowable, an otherwise proper restriction requirement between product claims and process claims may be maintained. Withdrawn process claims that are not commensurate in scope with an allowed product claim will not be rejoined. See "Guidance on Treatment of Product and Process Claims in light of *In re Ochiai, In re Brouwer* and 35 U.S.C. § 103(b)," 1184 O.G. 86 (March 26, 1996). Additionally, in order to retain the right to rejoinder in accordance with the above policy, Applicant is advised that the process claims should be amended during prosecution either to maintain dependency on the product claims or to otherwise include the limitations of the product claims. Failure to do so may result in a loss of the right to rejoinder.

- 8. Further, note that the prohibition against double patenting rejections of 35 U.S.C. 121 does not apply where the restriction requirement is withdrawn by the examiner before the patent issues. See MPEP § 804.01.
- 9. A telephone call was made to Mr. Michael Krawzsenek on April 19, 2005 to request an oral election to the above restriction requirement, but did not result in an election being made.
- 10. Applicant is advised that the reply to this requirement to be complete must include an election of the invention to be examined even though the requirement be traversed (37 CFR 1.143).
- 11. Applicant is reminded that upon the cancellation of claims to a non-elected invention, the inventorship must be amended in compliance with 37 CFR 1.48(b) if one or more of the currently named inventors is no longer an inventor of at least one claim

Application/Control Number: 10/775,818

Art Unit: 1625

remaining in the application. Any amendment of inventorship must be accompanied by a diligently-filed petition under 37 CFR 1.48(b) and by the fee required under 37

CFR 1.17(h).

12. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the

examiner should be directed to Zinna N. Davis whose telephone number is 571-272-

0682. The examiner can normally be reached on M-F.

13. The fax phone numbers for the organization where this application or proceeding

is assigned are 703-872-9306 for regular communications.

14. Any inquiry of a general nature or relating to the status of this application or

proceeding should be directed to telephone number is 571-272-1600.

Zinna Northington Davis

Page 6

Primary Examiner Art Unit 1625

znd April 22, 2005